

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Michael E. Sanders,)	
)	C/A No.: 6:11-cv-02734-GRA
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	(Written Opinion)
Joseph Battles, administrator for the)	
Abbeville County Detention Center, in)	
his official and individual capacity, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter comes before the Court for review of Magistrate Kevin F. McDonald's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., and filed on May 23, 2012. Plaintiff filed his complaint on October 13, 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Under established local procedure in this judicial district, Magistrate Judge McDonald made a careful review of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 & 1915A and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends that this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and grant Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment. This Court adopts the magistrate's recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th Cir. 1983). This Court gave Plaintiff a fourteen-day extension of time to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. ECF No. 94. Objections in this case were due on July 10, 2012. Plaintiff has filed no objections.

After a review of the record, this Court finds that the magistrate's Report

and Recommendation accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Ross Anderson, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

July 16, 2012
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of this Order, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, will waive the right to appeal.